
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2019

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/19/3230080

18 Hollybank, Droylsden, Tameside, Manchester M43 7SP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Julie North against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00254/FUL, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to No 18 Hollybank (No 18), a two storey house that sits within a short row of three terraced houses linked by a car port to a pair of semi-detached houses. There is an existing porch to the front of the house and it is proposed to extend over this at first floor level to accommodate an en-suite bathroom.
4. Nos 8-20 Hollybank are a mixture of semi-detached and terraced houses, but are very uniform in their appearance, notably including front monopitch porches, with gable roof detailing over the first floor window above.
5. The extension would not extend further than the existing porch and would be finished in matching external materials. However, the first floor extension would result in a two storey projecting gable which would be very dominant in the street scene and would result in the loss of rhythm and uniformity of houses on this side of Hollybank. Further, although forming part of a terrace of three, Nos 18 and 20 Hollybank are handed so that the porch for No 18 is not centrally located in the elevation of the terrace. The size and scale of the proposed extension would unbalance this composition.
6. I have had regard to Nos 12 and 14 Newton Street (Nos 12 and 14) referred to by the appellant which have been extended at first floor in a similar way to the proposals before me. Nos 12 and 14 are a pair of semi-detached houses at the

end of Newton Street adjacent larger detached houses. The extension of both Nos 12 and 14 means that the elevation would not be unbalanced in a similar way to the appeal proposal and they are not therefore directly comparable. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposals on its merits and against the particular street scene within which it would be set.

7. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan, 2004, which all promote good design that responds well to local context and surroundings.
8. There would also be a conflict with the guidance at Policies RED1 and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document, 2010 because the extensions would alter the scale and massing of the house in a way that was not appropriately proportioned, detracting from the character of the street scene.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR